

**REMARKS**

Claims 11-15 and 108-115 are currently pending in this application. Claims 11, 12, 13, 109-111 and 115 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Applicant graciously acknowledges the examiner's indication that claims 12-15 and 109 contain allowable subject matter. Claim 12 has been rewritten in independent form. Claim 12 includes all limitations of the base claim 11, except that the phrase "bottom layer" has been changed to recite "first layer." Applicants believe that this amendment does not affect the allowability of claim 12 or the claims depending therefrom.

Claims 11, 108 and 110-115 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Dennison, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0036232 (Dennison). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As amended, independent claim 11 recites, *inter alia*, "a chalcogenide layer overlying the first layer" and "a silver layer overlying the chalcogenide layer." The Office Action notes that Dennison discloses a metal layer 300 over a chalcogenide layer 290. Office Action at 2. Dennison's metal layer 300, however, is a titanium diffusion barrier layer 300. Thus, Dennison fails to disclose "a silver layer overlying the chalcogenide layer," as recited by amended claim 11. For at least these reasons, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 110-113 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dennison. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 110-113 depend from independent claim 11. As discussed above, Dennison fails to disclose, teach or suggest "a silver layer overlying the chalcogenide

layer," as recited by amended claim 11. Dennison states that the titanium layer 300 is used in conjunction with a titanium nitride layer 310 to prevent the signal line material 315 from diffusing into the chalcogenide layer 290. Titanium/titanium nitride layers are well known for being effective diffusion barriers. A silver layer, however, would not be an effective diffusion barrier for preventing the signal line material 315 from diffusing into the chalcogenide layer 290 in Dennison's device. Thus, neither Dennison nor the prior art provide any motivation for replacing Dennison's diffusion barrier layer with a silver layer. For at least these reasons, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: May 17, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By  \_\_\_\_\_

Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No.: 28,371

Elizabeth Parsons

Registration No.: 52,499

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &  
OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorneys for Applicant